DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 724 JC 710 223

AUTHOR	Oosting, Kenneth W.
TITLE	Extending Environmental Research to the Community College.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., Los Angeles. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Coll. Information.
REPORT NO	Topical-Pap-25
PUB DATE	Sep 71
NOTE	42p.
AVAILABLE FROM	ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 96 Powell Library, University of California, Los Angeles 90024 (Limited supply available free of charge)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*College Environment, Educational Environment, *Educational Research, Environmental Influences, *Environmental Research, Institutional Environment, *Institutional Research, *Junior Colleges, Questionnaires, Research, School Surveys, Surveys

ABSTRACT

Researchers have been interested in environmental effect on human behavior since the 1930s and have lately developed complex testing instruments and techniques for its study. In this paper, campus characteristics are synonymous with campus environment. Concern is with environmental effects on human behavior, and not the environmental components themselves. The Press-Need Concepts (Murray 1938) were an initial attempt to explain personality in terms of environment. Other work elaborated on the Press-Need Concepts as analytical tools for assessing personal satisfaction or frustration. Several testing instruments to evaluate the applicability of the Press-Need Concepts in 4-year educational institutions were developed (Activities Index, College Characteristics Index, High School Characteristics Index). Development of these instruments allowed the researcher to apply the Press-Need Concepts to groups rather than to individuals. Later Pace developed a briefer, yet valid instrument (College and University Environmental Scales) to supplement the earlier tests. Results from using these instruments in a junior college setting were unsatisfactory and led to the construction of an alternative 2-part instrument (Junior College Environmental Scales). This work, done by Hendrix, was later extended by the author of this paper in the development of his own instruments (Faculty Environmental Preference Scales and Faculty Environmental Scales). (AL)

ED053724

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EXTENDING ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH TO THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Kenneth W. Oosting

JC 710 223

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges

Graduate School of Education and the University Library
University of California
Los Angeles 90024

Topical Paper No. 25
September 1971

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

OCT 13 1971

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

This Topical Paper was prepared pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

TOPICAL PAPERS

1. A Developmental Research Plan for Junior College Remedial Education. July 1968. Out of print. ED 022 479.

2. A Developmental Research Plan for Junior College Remedial Education; Number 2: Attitude Assessment. November 1968. Out of print. ED 026 050.

3. Student Activism and the Junior College Administrator: Judicial Guidelines. December 1968.

4. Students as Teachers. January 1969.

5. Is Anyone Learning to Write? February 1969.

6. Is It Really a Better Technique? March 1969. Out of print. ED 030 410.

7. A Developmental Research Plan for Junior College Remedial Education; Number 3: Concept Formation. August 1969. Out of print. ED 032 072.

8. The Junior College in International Perspective. January 1970.

9. Identifying the Effective Instructor. January 1970.

10. Financing Higher Education: A Proposal. February 1970.

11. The Person: A Conceptual Synthesis. March 1970.

12. The Position Papers of Black Student Activists. September 1970.

13. Case Studies in Multi-Media Instruction. October 1970.

14. The Laws Relating to Higher Education in the Fifty States, January 1965-December 1967. October 1970.

15. Nationwide Pilot Study on Articulation. November 1970.

16. The President's Reaction to Black Student Activism. January 1971.

17. The Dynamic Interaction of Student and Teacher. February 1971.

18. Directions for Research and Innovation in Junior College Reading Programs. February 1971.

19. Some Philosophical and Practical Concepts for Broadening the Base of Higher Education in Virginia. April 1971.

20. Skill Development in Junior College Reading Programs. May 1971.

21. Community College Reading Center Facilities. May 1971.

22. Black Studies as a Curriculum Catalyst. May 1971.

23. Exemplary Practices in Junior College Reading Instruction. May 1971.

24. Training Faculty for Junior College Reading Programs. May 1971.

25. Extending Environmental Research to the Community College. September 1971.

Copies are available from UCLA Students' Store - Mail Out, 308 Westwood Plaza, Los Angeles 90024. Prices available on request. The out-of-print issues are available (by ED number) from ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P. O. Drawer O, Bethesda, Md. 20014. Payment must accompany orders of $10.00 or less and should include sales taxes where applicable. No handling charge is required.

EXTENDING ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH
TO THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

CONTENTS

Study of Human Environments 1

Henry Murray's Press-Need Concepts 2

Instruments in Four-Year Institutions 3

Community College Use 7

Future of the Study of Campus Environments 11

Footnotes. 14

References 18

Table 1. Duling: Student Subgroup Differences in
Perceptions of Environmental Press 6
Table 2. Oosting: Actual Faculty Dimensions 10

Appendix A. Junior College Environment Scales (JCES) 23
Appendix B. Faculty Environmental Preference Scales (FEPS) 29

EXTENDING ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH TO THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

The Study of Human Environments

Since the 1930s, researchers have been looking at the environment of humans as it affects behavior in that setting. Complex instruments for its study and computer analysis of the results have now been developed. This Paper explains how environmental research expanded in an orderly and logical fashion from the early work by Murray to the community college today.

College campuses as an example of human environment today are a puzzle to many onlookers. Going to college may be quite a different experience from the 1930s or 1940s. Students, some may conclude, are very different from the fellow students recalled by the observer. Most important and alarming to another generation are the seriousness of students and the depth and far-reaching implications of their topics of debate. Also, what about faculty? Why are deans so different today? What about the point that the differences observed are superficial rather than real?

Adding to the public's confusion is the contrast between San Francisco State and many other colleges where no such turmoil exists. One may suspect that the news media have distorted this impression. Are the current campus disturbances related to certain characteristics on campus? If so, which characteristics and how do you discover them?

Campus characteristics are synonymous with campus environment. Environment, as used in this context, refers to the human setting and all related phenomena in that setting, including non-human objects. Current interest is in environmental effects on those who inhabit it, not in the environmental components themselves, such as air, water, automobiles, or animals. Thus we have a common interest with those studying the physical effects of air and water pollution—in fact, all possible effects of the particular form of pollution under examination. The study of campus environments is primarily a psychological one, focusing on human behavior, motivations, and feelings as well as the stimuli for them. It seeks to answer such questions as those raised in the opening paragraphs.

The study of environments of educational institutions has evolved over the past thirty-five years from tentative assumptions to the highly complex studies of environment being conducted today. Environmental research in the community colleges has evolved from previous research of this type in universities and secondary schools. As the validity of certain instruments and techniques was established for universities, they were applied to other segments of education with, of course, changes in emphasis and nature as required. The many years of basic psychological research and the use of preliminary as well as tested instruments in other

institutions are basic to interest in community college environmental research. This psychological research has dealt with personality needs and assessments, the nature of environments, press and need in an environment, determinants of human behavior, evaluation and measurement, group compared to individual needs, and how individuals and groups relate to their environment in an educational setting.

To better understand the nature of an interest in campus environments, a definition of the term "environmental research" as used here may be helpful. It means taking into account the sum of the characteristics in a particular setting as perceived or preferred by an identifiable group that exists or has existed within that setting and in which the observer must be a participant. Thus such research examines a given human environment to determine some of its effects, real and potential, on the individuals in it. The subtleties of this human environment are considerable and not adequately predictable except by careful research. Besides looking at the subtleties of such an environment, one must pay attention to the interaction between the individual and his environment. Because each individual or group creates much of the environment to suit its own tastes and values, a look at that environment will tell us much about the individual or group.

Henry Murray's Press-Need Concepts

Close scrutiny of environments became possible only after much basic psychological research had been done and certain conclusions reached. The basic research was begun by Henry Murray and others at Harvard Psychological Clinic. He published Explorations in Personality in 1938 (1). For their study, they assumed they were dealing with individuals, not groups of individuals, and that at every moment the individual is within an environment that in part determines his behavior (2). To study personality (his primary goal), Murray felt forced to study the environmental effects upon the individual. We must keep in mind that this group was primarily interested in personality, not environment. Environment was simply a means of getting a closer look at personality. Nevertheless, this was the first serious attempt to study human environment.

Murray and his associates came to see environment as characterized by two psychological influences, press and need. The concept of press is best explained by Murray:

> For example, a press may be nourishing, or coercing, or injuring, or chilling, or befriending, or restraining, or amusing, or belittling to the organism. It can be said that a press is a temporal *Gestalt* of stimuli or promise of benefit to the organism. It seems that organisms quite naturally "classify" the objects of their world in this way: "this hurts," "that is sweet," "this comforts," "that lacks support" (3).

One of the most active researchers in this field, C. Robert Pace at UCLA, views press ". . . as a feature of the environment which is relevant to the satisfaction or frustration of a need" (4). Murray adds that all phenomena in our environment are either passive or inert: passive being that which could cause harm or benefit to the individual and inert being that which has no effect (5). Press is a part of our environment that affects us in a way that may cause us to modify our behavior. Often this press is indirect, part of a larger physical environment of which the human environment is only a part. Press may be as personal as a smile or a frown from an acquaintance or as impersonal as a gust of warm or cold wind.

Press represents the significant determinants of individual behavior by inciting or creating a psychological drive that is then either frustrated or satisfied over a wide spectrum. This frustration or satisfaction will be reflected in environmental research. Measuring the extent and nature of press as it affects people is the nature of environmental studies. Work has also been done on Murray's need concept, but that will not be treated here since its development as a concept is not directly related to the study of campus environments.

Instruments in Four-Year Institutions

Following the initial explorations by Murray and his associates, much time elapsed before serious attent on was given to the implications of their study for campus environments. The first to begin such a study was George C. Stern. He developed the Activities Index (AI), which led the way for development of the press concept with application to groups rather than to individuals. Murray had developed 30 personality needs, which became the basis for Stern's Activities Index. Following this, Pace and Stern created the College Characteristics Index (CCI), which contains thirty press scales corresponding with the need scales in the Activities Index, to measure the college student's environmental (press) counterparts of the needs expressed.

Stern and Pace, reflecting their different interests, took different paths in using College Characteristics Index data. Stern was concerned with personality assessment and looked at the CCI as it reflected individual response (6) and its relationship to personality. Pace was more interested in evaluation and measurement in higher education and, as a result, used the CCI data as the basis for further research in the derivation of institutional scores and norming. Note that Stern has pursued Murray's interest in personality as related to environment. Pace broadened environmental research to other fields, filling a gap without which other institutional or group research would not have been possible.

Stern extended the CCI into the secondary schools with development of the High School Characteristics Index (HSCI). John E. Jones found that nine factors

from intercorrelations of the thirty scales in the HSCI accounted for 68% of the variance (7). The nine factors were Intellectual Self-Expression, Coercive Climate, Authoritarian Press, Sociability, Academic Climate, Counteraction, Risktaking, Progressiveness, and Repressive Climate (8). James C. Hansen and Richard W. Warner, Jr., using the HSCI (9), studied the relationship between student perceptions of high school environment and personal needs in an academic setting. They found a significant relationship between the students' view of intellectual press and their intellectual needs on the one hand and the students' academic adjustment on the other (10).

Pace, in directing his research to the college as a unit rather than to the individual, has been concerned with developing dimensions (clusters of items) that would clearly discriminate one college campus from another. Orienting research to the college as a unit has been significant in establishing group environmental research, making it possible to look at a group as complex as a campus. Before this, attention had been devoted to the environment of individuals and the effect of press on personality and behavior.

Using this approach, Pace then developed the College and University Environmental Scales (CUES), which became available in 1963. In developing the CUES instrument, Pace selected a sample of 50 four-year institutions and used half the 300 items originally appearing in the College Characteristics Index. The shorter instrument was easier to administer and just as effective as a research tool. As a criterion or goal, Pace made an attempt to "identify a set of dimensions along which college environments differed from one another and, second, to measure these dimensions by a set of items which most clearly and sharply reflected the differences between environments" (12).

The CUES instrument has been widely used across the United States during the last seven years. In the selection of items, however, no attempt was made to include characteristics or peculiarities of junior colleges, because the instrument was intended only for four-year colleges.

In a 1966 publication, Pace concluded that CUES scores are quite stable over a period of one or two years when comparable student samples are used (13), and are substantially stable for even five to seven years. This stability meant that a particular environment had much the same press over a period as long as seven years.

Pace found that seniors, juniors, and sophomores share pretty much the same view of their environment, but freshmen may hold different views because they have not been on campus long enough to form consistent impressions (14). Because the findings concerning sophomores and upper classmen were based on the four-year college, how they can be applied to the community college is not

clear. Pace did conclude that students need to be on campus for two or more years to perceive the environment accurately. This suggests that only sophomores in a community college setting may be relied on for a picture of the environment. In the community college, these students will typically include only 10 to 35 percent of the student body, thus raising questions about whether a community college environment can be accurately measured at all. Since the community college is typically smaller than the four-year institution, however, certain facets of the environment may be more quickly diffused among the student body and in turn reflected in environmental measurement.

A recent study using CUES was completed by David G. Jansen and Bob B. Winborn, who compared social-political action leaders with four other types of students leaders on how the groups perceive campus environment (15). Using an analysis of variance, four scales were found to be significantly different (practicality, scholarship, community, and awareness) (16).

Donald W. Thistlethwaite published a 1963 study in which he found that press in a college setting affects a male student's motivation to seek advanced education (17). The five press scales that this study produced were found to be of no value, however, in identifying or predicting the colleges that will have the highest retention rate of talented college students. In a study published in 1965, Thistlethwaite found high correlations between certain types of press (found when using the College Characteristics Index) and student productivity in the natural sciences, arts, humanities, and social sciences (18). The findings of Thistlethwaite have been partially substantiated by A. W. Astin who, in his research, has taken the position that the meaning of certain relationships depends in the long run on our ability to characterize a college environment from the vantage of the student's experience (19). Astin has been primarily concerned with the individual in his environmental research. The environmental dimensions he developed were shown to be related to the Ph.D.-producing rates of certain colleges and the motivation of students in such programs (20). Further, a study by him with J. L. Holland found a relationship between the College Characteristics Index and the environmental dimensions developed by Astin (21).

Using the CCI and other data analyses, Vernon L. Hendrix (22) has found a relationship between high scores on certain scales and the presence or absence of faculty personnel policies in the areas of formal evaluation, tenure, merit-rating systems, and academic rank. A low student press for interaction, change, activity, and emphasis on matters not involving interpersonal and social relations is highly correlated with the presence of faculty tenure. Looking at academic rank in junior colleges, Hendrix found a relationship between rank and certain undesirable environmental characteristics (23).

Stern (24), in discussing the validity of the Activities Index and the College Characteristics Index in particular and environmental instruments in general, contended that their use substantiates the following conclusions:

1. There is greater variability between students as they describe themselves. . .than. . .in their descriptions of their college press.
2. Press scale profiles based on miscellaneous student samples tend to be consistent with those from more specialized samples of National Merit Scholars and Finalists, faculty, and administrations at the same institutions.
3. Environmental descriptions based solely on press appear to be recognized and confirmed by academic participants and observers.
4. There are significant relationships between press scale profiles and the types of institutions sampled.

Several studies have been concluded in the past several years that in various ways have extended the more general and basic work of Stern, Pace and others. Some work has been done with student view of press as well as with college influence upon students. Other studies have dealt with teachers and counselors in addition to new methods of describing campus cultures.

Concerning students and their environment, Vern C. Lewis substantiated the concept that students are more likely to succeed in a given area when their score is high in the same areas on a scale of attitude-press items (25). The study by Hansen and Warner was referred to earlier (26). Perception difference between subgroups was also explored by John A. Duling using a shortened version of CUES with college juniors (see Table 1) (27). Other similar studies are noted (28). At least one study of college influence on the student has been completed (29).

Table 1. Student Subgroup Differences in Perceptions of Environmental Press

SCALES				
Practicality	*Community*	*Awareness*	*Propriety*	*Scholarship*
F-I	M-F	S-M	M-F	S-M
0.05 level	F-I	0.05 level	0.001 level	0.05 level
	0.01 level		S-M	N-T
			0.05 level	0.05 level

Subgroup Code: M-F = male, female; F-I = fraternities, independent; S-M = single, married; N-T = native, transfer

Two studies of faculty may be noted. Gordon E. Greenwood and others, using a typology based on Murray, compared teaching and publishing press (30). A study was conducted at Drake University of faculty attitudes toward specific proposed innovations in university environments (31).

An interesting study by Walz and Miller examined implications for the school counselor based on a relationship between student behavior and school environment (32). Craeger and Astin completed a study of variables that may be used in describing campus environments (33).

Community College Use

Application of this research to the community junior college has required modifying the instruments to fit the uniqueness of the institution and verifying its usefulness by research. Quite a bit of the recent environmental research has been on the environment of junior colleges. Early in 1967, Pace discussed the value and nature of research needed in this area (34). He noted three considerations: (1) CUES had been designed for four-year institutions, (2) the number of two-year institutions was rapidly growing, and (3) CUES had been used by Hendrix in junior colleges. He concluded that CUES did not function as well in discriminating junior college environments as it did in four-year colleges. Further research was in order, but not using CUES as an instrument—a new one was needed. Pace suggested that additional dimensions in such areas as the technical-vocational might be needed in addition to those already used in CUES. In general, however, he felt that CUES had proven itself as a basic document and that junior college research could be done using a modification of it rather than starting over as in an entirely new field of research. This conclusion is shared by Hendrix in his research.

Hendrix has been the primary researcher in environments of junior colleges. Two major U.S. Office of Education projects have been undertaken by Hendrix using environmental research techniques in the junior college community. To carry out the projects, he needed a new instrument. His recent research efforts have been devoted to developing an instrument that will discriminate junior college environments as perceived by students. Hendrix described the sample of 100 junior colleges that administered the Junior College Environmental Scales (JCES) (see Appendix A), the Faculty Environmental Preference Scales (FPS) and the Student Preference Scales (SPS). The items in the three instruments were essentially the same with different emphases to cover the different purposes. JCES was written so that junior college students would reflect what they felt they saw in a particular environment. SPS and FPS were given to junior college students and faculty respectively, as instruments to determine preference. The items, however, related almost exclusively to student characteristics and conduct. Faculty members were not asked to look at a total junior college environment.

The three major purposes of the 1967 study by Hendrix were: (1) "to discover the relationships between community characteristics (external determinants) and certain criteria (outputs)"; (2) "to discover relationships. . .between external determinants and the environmental press of the college as perceived by students"; and (3) "to discover functional relationships between the environmental press of the college and the criteria" (36).

The FPS was used by Hendrix as one of the three subsets of variables external to the college, the other two being community characteristics and student preferences (37). Only two dimensions of significance in explaining expressions of faculty preference appeared with use of the FPS. Dimension F1 of the FPS

> . . .is concerned primarily with the nature of the student body. Faculty members appear to not prefer students that are not interested in the basic business of the college, i.e. academic achievement. In general, faculty members would evidently prefer intelligent, serious, purposeful, dedicated, goal oriented students, as opposed to those previously described.
>
> The second scale appears to describe a liberal arts dimension. The stereotyped picture of the small, selective, intellectually active liberal arts college is located at the preferred end of this dimension.
>
> Involvement and concern in social and cultural issues and problems are characteristic of the college community in general. Friendly individual and group interactions are indicated between and among faculty members and students (38).

Hendrix has extended the work of Pace on students at the four-year college or university to include junior college students. Preliminary work was done by Hendrix on relationships between various indices of the community and functional relationships within the college. He was also the first to attempt measurement of faculty-perceived environment. In this attempt, he concluded that: (1) faculty-perceived environment is so similar to student-perceived environment that the same instrument with minor revisions can be used for either population, (2) environmental perceptions by faculty are reliable indicators of environmental characteristics, and (3) high correlations exist between student- and faculty-perceived environment on the many items where a similar response might be expected.

This writer undertook a logical extension of the work by Hendrix with the FPS instrument. Two instruments, the Faculty Environmental Preference Scales (FEPS) and the Faculty Environmental Scales (FES) (39) (see Appendixes) were devised for use with junior college faculties. The FEPS and FES differ from the work by Hendrix (FPS) in several ways:

1. the items have a much broader base, in that they refer to all aspects of the environment in the college
2. the items are all pertinent to the experience of the faculty member, whereas FPS asked faculty to react to aspects of their students' experiences
3. the items in the more recent FEPS deal with aspects of state systems and multi-campus districts, a factor of no special concern to Hendrix.

The FPS was built on a careful examination of the literature on junior colleges in order to capture all facets of an institution in the document. Of particular concern in examining the literature was discerning the issues important to the junior/community college and to its faculty members. This concern was basic to the development of the new instrument, the Faculty Environmental Preference Scales. The instruments were all built by developing a number of tentative dimensions (clusters of items) with each dimension based on an issue suggested by the literature. These dimensions were then tested by the group on whom the instrument was being used. The result was a group of dimensions found by using a factor analysis.

The items in the FEPS and FES are the same. The instruments differ in that, with the FEPS, the respondent is asked to react to environmental preferences, whereas, in the FES, he reacts to actual perceptions.

The FEPS was administered to faculties in the Virginia and Minnesota state junior college systems and found to be useful. Both states operate all their community colleges under a single state board, with colleges located throughout the state. All 16 colleges in Virginia and 8 of the 16 in Minnesota were the sample for the study. All new faculty members at each college were involved under the assumption that new faculty represented all faculty when they joined the staff and were not yet affected by experience at that college. Five clusters of items (preferred dimensions) appeared, including Communication-Intellectual, Liberal Arts, Alienation, Regimentation, and Outgoingness. The dimensions described preferences of discernible (different facets of preference) groups of faculty members (see Table 2).

Certain relationships among these dimensions may be observed. The most important findings of this study, however, may be in the several implications for further environmental research rather than in the specific dimensions developed and their inter-relationships.

The studies of Murray in the 1930s as well as more recent studies by Pace, Hendrix, and others have been further validated by this study. The research has been extended in three directions. One is the evolution of an environmental instrument for measuring press perceived by junior college faculties. Being the first press

Table 2. Actual Faculty Dimensions (40)

A. Communication-Intellectual: Individuals do not feel a very great need for communication with administrators and other faculty members and do not feel a need to extend themselves in academic pursuit. Such individuals may perceive their immediate environment as intellectual and feel that greater communication would mean more intellectual involvement.

B. Liberal Arts: The faculty at the college strongly prefer an emphasis on the liberal arts as opposed to technical-vocational programs that emphasize marketable skills. The traditional, four-year liberal arts college is seen as a model of what the junior college should be.

C. Alienation: Individuals within a group have a tendency to feel that the total group or the administration of the college is pursuing quite dissimilar goals and is not sympathetic to the values or goals held by the individual. This may be expressed in a lack of sympathy with the college purposes, dissatisfaction with the college and other members of the staff, and dislike for close relationships with students and the community in which the college is located.

D. Regimentation: Formalism, tradition and submissiveness exist. Faculty members quite willingly accept assignments and rules, frown upon experimentation and expect administrative control.

E. Outgoingness: Faculty members tend to be interested in and responsive to communication and interaction with other teachers, administrators, and members of the community.

---

instrument designed for faculty, it suggests that a similar one might now be developed for use with faculties in four-year and graduate institutions. Such an instrument could be written in a manner similar to that used in developing the FEPS, incorporating items that reflect the university faculty member's environment. Few items in FEPS would need to be changed.

A second extension of the previous work is in the possibilities now available to compare student and faculty preferences within the same environment. Hendrix and Thistlethwaite have measured both faculty and student environment for the same college at a given time. This study now suggests the appropriateness of such research using two instruments, one built around items meaningful to students and the other around items meaningful to faculty members.

A third extension is found in the conclusion that actual environment can be as easily studied as preferred environment. An instrument to measure actual

environment has been prepared by this writer and tentative plans have been made to apply it in the near future. The benefit of this extension is the possibility now of comparison studies of preferred and actual environment within a particular college or group of colleges.

Operating from a slightly different theoretical base, several studies have been done in the elementary and secondary schools on faculty perceptions of environments. The work by Andrew W. Halpin and Don B. Croft in developing the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) in 1963 was the beginning (41). While CUES was prepared by Pace for use in universities, the OCDQ was being developed by Halpin and Croft for the elementary schools. A difference between the two instruments was that Halpin and Croft were attempting to look at the school environment by examining separately the behavior of teachers and principals. Halpin and Croft found four dimensions of teacher behavior: disengagement, hindrance, esprit, and intimacy. The four dimensions of principal behavior were aloofness, production emphasis, thrust, and consideration (42). Halpin and Croft described schools as having open or closed climates with several gradations in between (43).

Several subsequent studies were completed using the models and concepts of Halpin and Croft, two in the elementary schools, and one in the secondary schools (44). The findings of these studies were expressed in typical behavior and personality traits when certain dimensions surfaced.

Future of the Study of Campus Environments

The preceding pages have reviewed the research completed in the environments of educational campuses. Most of it has been directly related to higher education, although instruments have been developed for use with high school students (but not faculty). Preferred, as opposed to actual, environment instruments have been limited to higher education.

As we look at the future and its possibilities, the following illustration may be helpful.

Actual Environment			Preferred Environment		
Elementary & High School	University	Community College	Elementary & High School	University	Community College
1. Faculty	3. Faculty	5. Faculty	7. Faculty	9. Faculty	11. Faculty
2. Students	4. Students	6. Students	8. Students	10. Students	12. Students

No work has been done with elementary and secondary faculty (groups 1 and 7) and only limited work with students (groups 2 and 8) in the above chart. Further research with these groups will be of considerable assistance in research with other groups.

Looking at groups 3, 4, 9, and 10 (the four-year institution, undergraduate and graduate), faculty environment (both preferred and actual) remains unexplored. With the tremendous impact of college and university faculty on higher education, future research with this group (9) could provide guidelines and some answers on how to deal with the extensive array of problems in higher education. Graduate schools (faculty and students) in particular remain unexplored. The basic work with students in four-year institutions (10) should be expanded.

The community college (5, 6, 11, and 12) has had studies of its students, although more recent work is now needed using the instruments previously developed or a variation of them. This is particularly true of environmental preference for both students and faculty. Although instruments exist for both actual and preferred environment studies with community college faculty, no study of actual environment has been conducted.

Further general inferences that might be drawn from environmental research include:

1. Studies of environment in non-educational settings. Some research, of course, has been done in industry to study such relationships as those between working conditions and productivity. Other possible studies include the environment (a) of the elderly, (b) of various social roles, and (c) of a commercial setting and its effect on customers and others.
2. Personality. The early work by Murray and more recent work by Stern have not fully explored the relationship between an environment and the creation or solidification of certain personality types.
3. Relationships between preferred and actual environment. When we can clearly see the difference between what is and what we would like, how does this affect or potentially affect human environment? Comparisons between actual and preferred environment will help to identify existing problems more clearly.
4. Relationships between people and issues. They may generally be explored through looking at how the environment affects the views and opinions, as well as the behavior, of people toward issues facing them.

Other possibilities will likely occur to the reader.

Staff (instructors, counselors, administrators) of community colleges will see many direct applications for their own use and study. Environmental studies will show us in community colleges (1) what characteristics we prefer in the college, (2) how we as a group view our institution, (3) data and views that are held about and by the staff, (4) data about the environment perceived and environment preferred that our students supply (comparison study), and (5) comparison studies that have been done separately within the college (e.g., perceptions of the industrial technology faculty held by the English faculty). The impact of such studies completed within a community college might lead to no less than a major, basic change in inter-personal relationships, institutional goals and procedures, or a reworking (or at least a thorough reappraisal) of all college activities and actions.

A fair conclusion concerning environmental research in the community college is that it has only begun—the possibilities for the future are limited largely by the researcher's imagination. It is hoped that faculties, students, and institutions will use environmental research to learn more about themselves and their interrelationship with others, with the general goal of making the institution more effective in achieving its goals.

In all areas, up-to-date studies of actual and preferred environments are needed. They may further validate existing instruments or may lead to the development of new ones. More important, such studies will help us to learn more about changing environments in our schools and colleges so that behavior within an environment or even the environmental setting itself can be amended to help attain the goals of our educational systems.

FOOTNOTES

1. Henry A. Murray, Explorations in Personality. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.

2. Murray, p. 39.

3. Murray, pp. 40-41.

4. C. Robert Pace, College and University Environmental Scales: Preliminary Technical Manual. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1963, p. 4.

5. Murray, p. 119.

6. G. C. Stern, "Personality-Centered Research and Psychological Unification," American Psychologist, Vol. 8, 1953, p. 442.

7. John E. Jones, "Components of the High School Environment," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 47: 1, September 1968, pp. 40-43.

8. Jones, pp. 42-43.

9. James C. Hansen and Richard W. Warner, Jr., "Environmental Press, Student Needs and Academic Adjustment," Journal of Educational Research, 63: 9, May-June 1970, pp. 404-406.

10. Hansen and Warner, pp. 405-406.

11. J. A. Davis, J. L. Spaeth, and Carolyn Huson, "A Technique for Analyzing the Effects of Group Competition," American Sociological Review, 26:2, April 1961, pp. 215-225.

12. C. Robert Pace, Preliminary Technical Manual, p. 17.

13. C. Robert Pace, Comparison of CUES Results from Different Groups of Reporters. Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1966.

14. C. Robert Pace, The Use of CUES in the College Admissions Process. Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1966.

15. David G. Jansen and Bob B. Winborn, "Perceptions of a University Environment by Social-Political Action Leaders," Personnel And Guidance Journal, 47: 3, November 1968, p. 218.

16. Jansen and Winborn, p. 220.

17. Donald L. Thistlethwaite, Recruitment and Retention of Talented College Students, Cooperative Research Project. Washington: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1963.

18. Donald L. Thistlethwaite, Effects of College upon Student Aspirations, Cooperative Research Project, U. S. Office of Education. Nashville: Vanderbilt University, 1965.

19. Alexander W. Astin, "An Empirical Characterization of Higher Education Institutions," Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 53, October 1962, pp. 224-235.

20. A. W. Astin, "Differential College Effects on the Motivation of Talented Students to Obtain the Ph.D.," Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 54, February 1963, pp. 63-71.

21. A. W. Astin and J. L. Holland, "The Environmental Assessment Technique: A Way to Measure College Environments," Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 52, December 1961, pp. 308-316.

22. Vernon L. Hendrix, "Academic Personnel Policies and Student Environmental Perceptions," Educational Administration Quarterly, 1:1, pp. 32-41.

23. Vernon L. Hendrix, "Academic Rank Revisited," Junior College Journal, 35: 5, February 1965, pp. 24-28.

24. George C. Stern, "The Intellectual Climate in College Environments," The College Student and His Culture: An Analysis. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968, pp. 205-224.

25. Vern C. Lewis, "Prediction of Academic Performance from Adolescent Attitude–Press Organizations," The Journal of Educational Research, 63: 5, January 1970, pp. 204-208.

26. Hansen and Warner.

27. John A. Duling, "Differences in Perceptions of Environmental Press by Selected Student Subgroups," Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 32: 3, Spring 1969, pp. 130-132.

28. Edmond Marks, "Individual Differences in Perceptions of the College Environment," Journal of Educational Psychology, 61: 4, pt. 1, August 1970, pp. 270-278; and Lionel S. Lewis, "The Value of College to Different Subcultures," The School Review, 77: 1, March 1969, pp. 32-40.

29. Kenneth A. Feldman, "Studying the Impacts of Colleges on Students," Sociology of Education, 42: 3, summer 1969, pp. 207-237.

30. Gordon E. Greenwood, John M. Newell, Charles M. Bridges, and George W. Etheridge, "Publication Press and Teaching Press," Improving College and University Teaching, 18: 2, Spring 1970, pp. 158-160.

31. Raymond Moore, "Structure of Faculty Attitudes Toward the University Teacher's Role: A Factor Analytic Study," Educational and Psychological Measurement, Vol. 30, 1970, pp. 293-299.

32. Garry Walz and Juliet Miller, "School Climates and Student Behavior: Implications for the Counselor Role," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 47: 9, May 1969, pp. 859-867.

33. John A. Craeger and Alexander W. Astin, "Alternative Methods of Describing Characteristics of Colleges and Universities," Educational and Psychological Measurement, Vol. 28, Autumn 1968, pp. 719-734.

34. C. Robert Pace, Explorations in the Measurement of Junior College Environments. Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1967.

35. Vernon L. Hendrix, Functional Relationships of Junior College Environments and Selected Characteristics of Faculties, Students, the Administration, and the Community, Cooperative Research Project, U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1967.

36. Hendrix, Functional Relationships, p. 4.

37. Hendrix, Functional Relationships, p. 108.

38. Hendrix, Functional Relationships, pp. 109-110.

39. Kenneth W. Oosting, Faculty Environment Preference Scales. Richmond: Virginia Department of Community Colleges, 1967; Kenneth W. Oosting, "Faculty Environmental Scales" 1968. (unpublished)

40. Kenneth W. Oosting, Dimensions of Preferred Faculty Environment in Public Junior Colleges. Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1968.

41. Andrew W. Halpin and Don B. Croft, The Organizational Climate of Schools. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1963.

42. Halpin and Croft, pp. 29-32.

43. Halpin and Croft, pp. 60-67.

44. Donald P. Anderson, Organizational Climate of Elementary Schools, Research Monograph No. 1, "A Study of the Relationships Between Organizational Climate of Elementary Schools and Personal Variables of the Principals," 1964; Robert J. Brown, Organizational Climate of Elementary Schools, Research Monograph No. 2, "Identifying and Classifying Organizational Climates in Twin Cities Area Elementary Schools," 1965; and James C. Sargent, Organizational Climate of High Schools, "A Study of Principal and Staff Perceptions of High School Organizational Climate." Danville, Illinois: The Interstate, 1967.

REFERENCES

Anderson, Donald P., Organizational Climate of Elementary Schools, Research Monograph No. 1, "A Study of the Relationships Between Organizational Climate of Elementary Schools and Personal Variables of the Principals." Danville, Illinois: The Interstate, 1964.

Astin, Alexander W., "Differential College Effects on the Motivation of Talented Students to Obtain the Ph.D., " Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 54, February 1963.

Astin, Alexander W., "An Empirical Characterization of Higher Education Institutions," Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 53, October 1962.

Astin, Alexander W. and J. L. Holland, "The Environmental Assessment Technique: A Way to Measure College Environments," Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 52, December 1961.

Brown, Robert J., Organizational Climate of Elementary Schools, Research Monograph No. 2, "Identifying and Classifying Organizational Climates in Twin Cities Area Elementary Schools." Danville, Illinois: The Interstate, 1965.

Craeger, John A. and Alexander W. Astin, "Alternative Methods of Describing Characteristics of Colleges and Universities," Educational and Psychological Measurement, Vol. 28, Autumn 1968.

Davis, J. A., J. L. Spaeth, and Carolyn Huson, "A Technique for Analyzing the Effects of Group Competition," American Sociological Review, 26:2, April 1961.

Duling, John A., "Differences in Perceptions of Environmental Press by Selected Student Subgroups," Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 32: 3, Spring 1969.

Feldman, Kenneth A., "Studying the Impacts of Colleges on Students," Sociology of Education, 42: 3. Summer 1969.

Greenwood, Gordon E., John M. Newell, Charles M. Bridges, and George W. Etheridge, "Publication Press and Teaching Press," Improving College and University Teaching, 18: 2, Spring 1970.

Halpin, Andrew W. and Don B. Croft, The Organizational Climate of Schools. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1963.

Hansen, James C. and Richard W. Warner, Jr., "Environmental Press, Student Needs and Academic Adjustment," Journal of Educational Research, 63:9, May-June 1970.

Hendrix, Vernon L., "Academic Personnel Policies and Student Environmental Perceptions," Educational Administration Quarterly, 1: 1, Winter 1965.

Hendrix, Vernon L., "Academic Rank Revisited," Junior College Journal, 35: 5, February 1965.

Hendrix, Vernon L., Functional Relationships of Junior College Environments and Selected Characteristics of Faculties, Students, the Administration, and the Community, Cooperative Research Project, U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1967.

Jansen, David G. and Bob B. Winborn, "Perceptions of a University Environment by Social-Political Action Leaders," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 47: 3, November 1968.

Jones, John E., "Components of the High School Environment," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 47: 1, September 1968.

Lewis, Lionel S., "The Value of College to Different Subcultures," The School Review, 77: 1, March 1969.

Lewis, Vern C., "Prediction of Academic Performance from Adolescent Attitude–Press Organizations," The Journal of Educational Research, 63: 5, January 1970.

Marks, Edmond, "Individual Differences in Perceptions of the College Environment," Journal of Educational Psychology, 61: 4, pt. 1, August 1970.

Moore, Raymond, "Structure of Faculty Attitudes Toward the University Teacher's Role: A Factor Analytic Study," Educational and Psychological Measurement, Vol. 30, 1970.

Murray, Henry A., Explorations in Personality. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.

Oosting, Kenneth W., Faculty Environmental Preference Scales. Richmond: Virginia Department of Community Colleges, 1967.

Oosting, Kenneth W., Faculty Environmental Scales. 1968 (unpublished).

Oosting, Kenneth W., Dimensions of Preferred Faculty Environment in Public Junior Colleges. Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1968.

Pace, C. Robert, College and University Environmental Scales: Preliminary Technical Manual. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1963.

Pace, C. Robert, Comparison of CUES Results from Different Groups of Reporters. Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1966.

Pace, C. Robert, The Use of CUES in the College Admissions Process. Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1966.

Pace, C. Robert, Explorations in the Measurement of Junior College Environments. Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1967.

Sargent, James C., Organizational Climate of High Schools, "A Study of Principal and Staff Perceptions of High School Organizational Climate." Danville, Illinois: The Interstate, 1967.

Stern, George C., "Personality-Centered Research and Psychological Unification," American Psychologist, Vol. 8, 1953.

Stern, George C., "The Intellectual Climate in College Environments," The College Student and His Culture: An Analysis. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.

Thistlethwaite, Donald L., Effects of College upon Student Aspirations, Cooperative Research Project, U.S. Office of Education. Nashville: Vandervilt University, 1965.

Thistlethwaite, Donald L., Recruitment and Retention of Talented College Students, Cooperative Research Project. Washington: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1963.

Walz, Garry and Juliet Miller, "School Climates and Student Behavior: Implications for the Counselor Role," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 47: 9, May 1969.

Appendix A

JUNIOR COLLEGE ENVIRONMENTAL SCALES

as appearing in

Section B, Part 2 of

JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENT INVENTORY

by Vernon L. Hendrix

University of Minnesota
1966

Part 2

INSTRUCTIONS:

All students do not like and dislike the same things about a junior college. What one person prefers another may dislike strongly. These preferences can affect the atmosphere of a college a great deal. Therefore, an adequate description of a junior college should include information about the preferences held by students at that college.

The statements in this section describe policies, practices, facilities, activities, and conditions in a hypothetical junior college. You need not have any particular college in mind; you are not being asked here about your own college. On the answer sheet provided, you are to indicate the extent to which you would prefer or not prefer to be in such an institution.

For each item, blacken the appropriate space on the answer sheet, using the following code:

A. I would definitely prefer and would enjoy immensely a junior college characterized by this statement.
B. I would prefer and would be comfortable in a junior college characterized by this statement, but it is not essential for me.
C. This statement does not affect me at all. If true of a junior college, it would make me neither comfortable nor uncomfortable and would neither be preferred nor unpreferred.
D. I would not prefer and would be somewhat uncomfortable in a junior college characterized by this statement, but I could tolerate it.
E. I would definitely not prefer and would be extremely uncomfortable in a junior college characterized by this statement.

Answer each item. Do not take too long on any one item. Let your first impression guide you.

1. There are courses which involve students in activities with groups or agencies in the local community.
2. In most classes students quickly learn everyone's name.
3. Students can take a semester or year abroad as part of their regular program.
4. Research is considered important by a lot of people on this campus.
5. Course offerings and faculty in the natural sciences are outstanding.
6. A lot of student discussion is generated by courses in government, politics, and international relations.

7. Many instructors encourage students to write themes or reports which analyze personal experience.
8. New fads and phrases are continually springing up among the students.
9. Many faculty members have worked overseas or frequently traveled to other countries.
10. Most student rooms are pretty messy.
11. Many of the social science professors are actively engaged in research.
12. There is very little studying here over the week-ends.
13. Students are sometimes noisy and inattentive at concerts and lectures.
14. It's important socially here to be in the right club or group.
15. There are lots of dances, parties, and social activities.
16. Many students are interested in and give support to such causes as Red Cross, Campus Chest, CARE, or Blood Banks.
17. Most courses are a real intellectual challenge.
18. Students often start projects without trying to decide in advance how they will develop or where they will end.
19. There are frequent informal social gatherings.
20. Many of the natural science professors are actively engaged in research.
21. Groups of students from the college often get together for parties or visits during holidays.
22. A lecture by an outstanding scientist would be poorly attended.
23. Students are very serious and purposeful about their work.
24. The person who is always trying to "help out" is likely to be regarded as a nuisance.
25. Many students seem to expect other people to adapt to them rather than trying to adapt themselves to others.
26. Few students bother with rubbers, hats, or other special protection against the weather.
27. In many classes there is a course outline or study guide for the students.
28. Students spend a lot of time worrying about what kind of jobs they can get.
29. To most students here, art is something to be studied rather than felt.
30. Students frequently do things on the spur of the moment.
31. Most students here are really bright.
32. Programs of study about a particular area or region are offered, e.g., Latin American studies, Russian studies, etc.
33. There is a lot of group spirit.
34. There is considerable interest in the analysis of value systems and the relativity of societies and ethics.

35. Tutorial or honors programs are available for qualified students.
36. A lecture by an outstanding literary critic would be poorly attended.
37. Class discussions are typically vigorous and intense.
38. Many instructors assign projects which call for group work.
39. Election to a science honorary society is a real mark of distinction.
40. Many students drive sports cars.
41. Prizes are given for creative work in writing, music, painting, and other arts.
42. Most students are interested in business, engineering, management, and other practical careers.
43. Spontaneous student rallies and demonstrations occur frequently.
44. The student health center or counseling bureau includes psychiatric services.
45. Few students are planning post-graduate work in the social sciences.
46. Student elections generate a lot of intense campaigning and strong feeling.
47. This institution has an excellent reputation for academic freedom.
48. There is a recognized group of student leaders on this campus.
49. Many students are interested in joining the Peace Corps or are planning, somehow, to spend time in another part of the world.
50. Groups of students sometimes spend all evening listening to classical records.
51. Most of the instructors are very thorough teachers and really probe into the fundamentals of their subjects.
52. Student groups often meet in faculty members' homes.
53. The library has paintings and/or phonograph records which circulate widely among the students.
54. The instructors go out of their way to help you.
55. The college regards training people for service to the community as one of its major responsibilities.
56. Typically the library is open until 10:30 p.m. or later.
57. The student newspaper rarely carries articles intended to stimulate discussion of philosophical or ethical matters.
58. There are courses or voluntary seminars that deal with problems of social adjustment.
59. Most students respond to ideas and events in a pretty cool and detached way.
60. Few students here would ever work or play to the point of exhaustion.

61. Course offerings and faculty in the social sciences are outstanding.
62. What is regarded as right and wrong is quite clear on this campus.
63. Well established ways of doing things are important here.

Appendix B

Faculty Environmental Preference Scales

by Kenneth W. Oosting

Virginia Department of
Community Colleges

1967

INTRODUCTION

The items on the following pages are possible characteristics of a junior college. You are asked to view each item in terms of your preference for that characteristic in a hypothetical junior college that is part of a state system of junior colleges or a multi-campus junior college district. (Reference to "central office" in the items refers to the state or district office.) Whether or not the characteristics exist in the college in which you are presently teaching is of no importance at this time. This instrument is intended to determine what you prefer in a junior college (community college) environment even if it does not presently exist.

Please circle the number to the left of each statement according to how strongly you prefer the characteristic described, using the following scale:

1. I would definitely prefer to be in a junior college characterized by this statement.

2. I would prefer to be in a junior college characterized by this statement but the existence of the characteristic is not essential to me.

3. I have no preference regarding a college characterized by this statement. Whether or not it exists would make no difference to me.

4. I would not prefer to be in a junior college characterized by this statement.

5. I would definitely not prefer to be in a junior college characterized by this statement.

The individual responses to this instrument will not be seen by any administrator at this college. Data compilation and analysis will be done by University of Minnesota personnel in Minneapolis. The general purpose of the items is to determine the environmental preference characteristics of junior college faculty members.

Please circle the number on the left (using the scale on the preceding page) that most closely approximates your preference for that characteristic in what you consider an ideal junior college.

1 2 3 4 5	1.	Faculty members usually eat lunch together as a group.
1 2 3 4 5	2.	Faculty members talk to each other about their personal life including such things as children and neighborhood activities.
1 2 3 4 5	3.	Talk about leaving this junior college is common among the faculty.
1 2 3 4 5	4.	The faculty socializes in small and rather select groups.
1 2 3 4 5	5.	The faculty and administration at the college are in agreement concerning the importance of the technical-vocational curriculum.
1 2 3 4 5	6.	Administrators encourage the faculty to be active in professional organizations such as the state education association and the NEA.
1 2 3 4 5	7.	Faculty members are usually in daily written or oral contact with some administrator.
1 2 3 4 5	8.	Faculty members generally put a lot of energy and enthusiasm into the classes they teach.
1 2 3 4 5	9.	There is an open exchange of ideas in faculty meetings.
1 2 3 4 5	10.	Administrators might at times visit with faculty members in the faculty member's office.
1 2 3 4 5	11.	Members of the faculty tend to know the family background of other faculty members.
1 2 3 4 5	12.	Many classroom lectures are given with little voice inflection or emphasis.

1 2 3 4 5 13. Faculty members often spark an interest in students for their studies.

1 2 3 4 5 14. Mannerisms of some faculty in the college are different from what might be considered normal.

1 2 3 4 5 15. Community involvement is expected of all the faculty.

1 2 3 4 5 16. Many of the faculty seem discontented with their teaching assignment.

1 2 3 4 5 17. Parents in the community emphasize the practical courses at the college rather than courses leading to transfer to a four-year college.

1 2 3 4 5 18. The college is or will be one of the better two-year colleges in the nation.

1 2 3 4 5 19. Administrators at the college keep their contact with the faculty at a minimum.

1 2 3 4 5 20. Members of the community become involved in planning the college's future.

1 2 3 4 5 21. The college exists primarily for students intending to transfer to a four-year college.

1 2 3 4 5 22. The college places emphasis upon preparing students with marketable skills.

1 2 3 4 5 23. People in the community do not seem to know very much about the college.

1 2 3 4 5 24. Many of the faculty are looking for employment elsewhere.

1 2 3 4 5 25. Local industrial leaders emphasize the practical courses at the college rather than courses leading to transfer to a four-year college.

1 2 3 4 5 26. Students are urged by the faculty to transfer from the college as soon as they have the opportunity to do so.

1 2 3 4 5 27. Most of the faculty believe that the college is a good place in which to teach.

1 2 3 4 5 28. New ideas often come from the faculty in regard to operation of the college.

1 2 3 4 5 29. The college is building a good reputation for academic freedom.

1 2 3 4 5 30. Faculty members talk about the college optimistically when they are together.

1 2 3 4 5 31. Faculty offices are individual and scattered throughout the college building(s).

1 2 3 4 5 32. It is easy to schedule a place for a departmental or other meeting.

1 2 3 4 5 33. There is considerable tension in relations between faculty and administration.

1 2 3 4 5 34. Important decisions relating to operation of the college appear to be made by administrators in the junior college central office.

1 2 3 4 5 35. The buildings and grounds are a source of real pride for everyone at the college.

1 2 3 4 5 36. Important information sometimes reaches faculty members through secretaries or newspapers.

1 2 3 4 5 37. Faculty offices are clustered together in a few areas.

1 2 3 4 5 38. Administrators on the campus send out regular bulletins at least every week.

1 2 3 4 5 39. Secretaries are employed for the exclusive use of the faculty.

1 2 3 4 5 40. The faculty keeps pretty much to itself and avoids fraternizing with students.

1 2 3 4 5 41. An attempt is made within the college to maintain very high academic standards.

1 2 3 4 5 42. The closest friends of faculty members are usually other faculty members rather than members of the community not associated with the college.

1 2 3 4 5 43. The administration places emphasis upon preparing students with marketable skills.

1 2 3 4 5 44. Faculty members do not get involved in community affairs.

1 2 3 4 5 45. Teaching in this college is unusually stimulating.

1 2 3 4 5 46. Secretaries and custodians who work for the college are generally not very friendly.

1 2 3 4 5 47. The education that students at the college receive tends to make them more realistic and practical.

1 2 3 4 5 48. Members of the faculty typically intend to spend the remaining part of their career in this institution.

1 2 3 4 5 49. The administration in this college tends to favor the college transfer curriculum over the technical-vocational.

1 2 3 4 5 50. Faculty members are generally enthusiastic about the college.

1 2 3 4 5 51. Research is considered by people on this campus to be something which is of minimal practical value.

1 2 3 4 5 52. Very few of the courses in the college will be useful to those students who go into industry.

1 2 3 4 5 53. Faculty members enjoy talking about the college with people they meet in the community.

1 2 3 4 5 54. Good shop facilities are available for technical courses at the college.

1 2 3 4 5 55. Faculty members who teach transfer courses generally approve of equal pay for technical instructors who have equal qualifications.

1 2 3 4 5 56. A place is provided on campus for the faculty to gather informally.

1 2 3 4 5 57. Experimental projects may be carried out by members of the faculty without much administration supervision.

1 2 3 4 5 58. Students spend very little time talking to the faculty.

1 2 3 4 5 59. Students at the college are interested in technical-vocational curriculums.

1 2 3 4 5 60. Administrators tell the faculty about new ideas they have encountered.

1 2 3 4 5 61. Committee assignments take very little of a faculty member's time.

1 2 3 4 5 62. Faculty members often go out of their way to establish friendly relations with their students.

1 2 3 4 5 63. Members of the faculty are rarely asked to speak to community groups.

1 2 3 4 5 64. Vocational-technical students have the same social and extra-curricular interests as college transfer students.

1 2 3 4 5 65. The environment at the college is such that members of the faculty are encouraged to publish articles and books.

1 2 3 4 5 66. The faculty seems personally interested in the success of their students.

1 2 3 4 5 67. Faculty members are asked for their ideas on the use of and development of buildings and grounds.

1 2 3 4 5 68. Most faculty members at the college have met or talked to on the phone one or more administrators from the junior college central office.

1 2 3 4 5 69. Mannerisms of individual faculty members in the college are considered typical or normal.

1 2 3 4 5 70. Faculty advisors encourage good students to enter technical programs.

1 2 3 4 5 71. Members of the faculty are typically involved in community affairs.

1 2 3 4 5 72. Student groups are not likely to invite faculty members to lead discussion groups or address them on an academic subject.

1 2 3 4 5 73. Very few of the faculty emphasize giving students the needed practical training for his career field.

1 2 3 4 5 74. There is considerable interest on this campus in poetry, music, painting, and architecture.

1 2 3 4 5 75. Deans are not generally accessible when faculty members wish to see them.

1 2 3 4 5 76. The college library is open evenings and weekends.

1 2 3 4 5 77. Most courses offered at the college require intensive study and preparation outside of class.

1 2 3 4 5 78. Class discussions are often vigorous and meaningful.

1 2 3 4 5 79. Students show considerable pride in the college.

1 2 3 4 5 80. Students generally have easy access to their instructors.

1 2 3 4 5 81. Students seem well informed about faculty and administration activities that are of general importance.

1 2 3 4 5 82. Most students consider weekends to be reserved for parties and other leisure time activities.

1 2 3 4 5 83. The faculty is affected considerably by rules and regulations set by the administration.

1 2 3 4 5 84. Office hours are often not adhered to by the faculty.

1 2 3 4 5 85. Faculty members are encouraged to take teaching problems to administrators.

1 2 3 4 5 86. The junior college central office communicates regularly with the faculty.

1 2 3 4 5 87. Faculty members are not expected to be involved in community affairs.

1 2 3 4 5 88. Faculty office hours are not normally posted.

1 2 3 4 5 89. Men on the faculty wear white shirts and ties while teaching.

1 2 3 4 5 90. Many of the faculty read literary works or read in fields in which they are not teaching for their own enjoyment.

1 2 3 4 5 91. Faculty members make very little use of the college library.

1 2 3 4 5 92. Faculty members generally do not join scholarly organizations such as the Organization of American Historians.

1 2 3 4 5 93. Faculty members send memos regarding academic matters to other members of the faculty.

1 2 3 4 5 94. The faculty is expected to be on the campus during specified hours each day.

1 2 3 4 5 95. Faculty members are encouraged to use their own judgment in decisions they make relating to the college.

1 2 3 4 5 96. Faculty members can easily telephone or walk to see other faculty members.

1 2 3 4 5 97. The college office retains control over the time that each course will be offered.

1 2 3 4 5 98. Most faculty members do not count any administrator among their personal friends.

1 2 3 4 5 99. Students are asked to read materials in the library in addition to their textbooks.

1 2 3 4 5 100. Faculty members participate in community cultural events.

1 2 3 4 5 101. Faculty members are given a number of routine duties including reports to the administration on such things as student progress.

1 2 3 4 5 102. Intellectual issues come up when faculty members get together.

1 2 3 4 5 103. Supplies and materials may be ordered by the faculty without much administrative control.

1 2 3 4 5 104. The primary concerns of the faculty are salary and teaching load.

1 2 3 4 5 105. Many of the faculty are members of professional organizations such as state and local education associations.

1 2 3 4 5 106. Very little tension exists in relations between the faculty and administration.

1 2 3 4 5 107. Faculty members have an outside door key to one or more college buildings.

1 2 3 4 5 108. The faculty keeps pretty much to itself and avoids close association with administrators.

1 2 3 4 5 109. Most faculty members include at least one administrator among their personal friends.

1 2 3 4 5 110. Reference to an article in a professional journal is at times made in meetings where two or more faculty members are present.

1 2 3 4 5 111. Each person on the faculty has committee assignments that take a considerable portion of his time.

1 2 3 4 5 112. Faculty members talk about going back to graduate school.

1 2 3 4 5 113. Instructors in technical-vocational subjects are treated in the same way as other instructors in regard to pay, tenure, and promotion.

1 2 3 4 5 114. The faculty tends to favor the technical-vocational curriculums over the college transfer.

1 2 3 4 5 115. Individual faculty members tend to be very practical and pragmatic in their approach to teaching.

1 2 3 4 5 116. Decisions by the state junior college board are accepted without discussion by the faculty.

Please indicate your name and college so that your responses may be paired with the results of a similar instrument that you will be asked to complete at a later date.

Name _____

College _____

☆ GPO 700-192